



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE.	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,784	10/626,784 07/24/2003		Yasunori Matsuda	04536.020001	1191
22511	7590	04/04/2006		EXAMINER	
OSHA LIA	NG L.L.I	Ρ.		LEE, MIC	CHAEL
1221 MCKINNEY STREET SUITE 2800				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HOUSTON,		10	2622		
				D. ME 14.11 ED 04/04/0004	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/626,784	MATSUDA, YASUNORI				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		M. Lee	2622				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a)	Since this application is in condition for allower	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicati	on Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of:  1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 7/24/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2622

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rau (6,741,277).

Regarding claim 1, Rau discloses a digital video signal unit 145 for generating test signals (col. 4, lines 49-53), which meets the generating section as claimed, and a testing processing unit, which meets the signal comparing section as claimed (see col. 5, line 65, to col. 6, lines 2), and a determining section (see col. 6, lines 21-67), except the noise section as claimed. In any event, the examiner takes Official Notice that using noise generator to simulate a real environment in a television receiver testing operation is well known in the art because the noise generated is able to test the true performance of the receiver. In addition, Rau teaches that other than the test pattern, additional patterns can be added to the system (see col. 8, lines 50-54). Hence, since the noise signal can be considered just another test pattern, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a noise generator into Rau so that the real performance of the receiver could be realized.

Regarding claim 2, the aforementioned noise generator includes a level adjuster.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,784

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claim 3, see col. 5, lines 41-45.

Regarding claim 4, see col. 5, lines 26-27, and 65-67.

Regarding claim 5, note output device 130.

Regarding claim 6, to better input the user, it would have been obvious to display different control parameters at the output device 130, such as control level of the noise generator.

Regarding claims 7-10, see corresponding rejections above.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, "said analog TV signal" lacks proper antecedent basis.

#### Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kamiyama et al. (5,260,784) shows a testing device.

Zeidler (6,734,898) shows a video quality measuring device.

Haselwood et al. (4,425,578) shows a comparator.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,784

Art Unit: 2622

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz, can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Lee

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2622